



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,957	10/15/2003	Joseph W. Cole	COLEI.0014P	8826
32856	7590	11/22/2004	EXAMINER	
WEIDE & MILLER, LTD. 7251 W. LAKE MEAD BLVD. SUITE 530 LAS VEGAS, NV 89128			ONEILL, MICHAEL W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3713	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

as

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,957	COLE, JOSEPH W.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael O'Neill	3713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3-26-04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: spelling error "currently" in line 6 should be "currency". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over IGT's Player's Choice Drop-in and Slant Top gaming machines in view of Itoi, USPN 4,268,076.

IGT discloses the components that typically construct the well known gaming machine. IGT lacks in clearly disclosing the mechanisms that are utilized to secure the currency container into the gaming machine housing. This is because the IGT document is a photograph showing only the exterior portions of the gaming machine housing and not the interior portion. However, it is clearly shown in the photographs the door and lock that are utilized to gain access to the currency container therein. This door and lock means are located under the top surface which presents the game to the player. Itoi teaches and suggests a currency container adapted to accept and store currency, see figure 1. The currency container per se is (2)a, the currency container locking mechanism is (3, 3a, 3b, 14), the locking mechanism is (5, 6 et al.), see figures 1 and 6. The secondary locking mechanism comprising a cam (6) moveable between first and second positions is met with cam (6) which as shown in the figure 6 moves between a first and second position in order to allow part of latch, (14), to move from first and second position as shown in figure 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the

Art Unit: 3713

teachings in Itoi to the cash box of IGT in order to provide a currency container which is simple, has excellent reliability and safety as suggested by Itoi in col. 1:39-41.

Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over IGT's Player's Choice Drop-in and Slant Top gaming machines in view of Itoi, USPN 4,268,076 further in view of Halic, USPN 5,700,195.

What IGT and Itoi disclose, teach and suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art is discussed above and incorporated herein. What the two above references lack in clearly disclosing is the panel movement and locking means for the panel. This is because IGT is a photograph just showing the exterior housing of the gaming machine and Itoi focuses securing a cash box to a housing. In an analogous device, Halic teaches and suggests a panel (15), its movement and the associated locking mechanism (16) within a well-known gaming machine and where the panel secures the cash box when the lock (16) is in the locked position and the panel unsecures the cash box when the lock (16) is unlocked, see figures 3-6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teachings of Halic to the aforementioned references above; in order to provide additional security of the cash box as suggested by Halic in column 1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8-9-4 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant needs to positively define the latching mechanism is physically connected to the currency container. Applicant claim language both in claims 1 and 3 do not recited the claimed invention in this manner. Applicant's arguments appear to define the invention in this manner; however, this is not what is claimed and thus the arguments are not commensurate in scope to the claimed invention; thus are deemed unpersuasive.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael O'Neill whose telephone number is 703-308-3484. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on 703-308-2064. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3713

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MON

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M O'NEILL', written in a cursive style.

MICHAEL O'NEILL
PRIMARY EXAMINER